

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

PLANTRONICS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE
COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: C 07-6038 PVT

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR AN
ORDER SHORTENING TIME
WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO A
REQUEST TO CONTINUE
DEADLINES SET BY THE
SCHEDULING ORDER HEREIN**

On January 31, 2008, Plaintiff filed a motion for an order shortening time on a motion to stay.¹ Having reviewed the papers submitted by the parties, the court finds it appropriate to issue this order without further briefing. Based on the moving papers,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for an order shortening time is DENIED. Plaintiff filed this action two months ago. At the time the action was filed, Plaintiff was given a copy of the scheduling order that sets the deadlines Plaintiff now seeks to avoid by shortening time for its motion to compel. Yet Plaintiff fails to explain why it did not simply file its motion sufficiently in advance of those deadlines to allow for the notice period prescribed in Civil Local Rule 7-2(a). Plaintiff's lack of diligence in getting its motion to stay on file is not good cause for

¹ The holding of this court is limited to the facts and the particular circumstances underlying the present motion.

1 shortening the Defendants' time to respond to that motion to 6 court days, and the court's time to
2 review the fully briefed motion to just 2 court days.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this order is without prejudice to Plaintiff filing either a
4 stipulation or administrative motion pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2 or 6-3 requesting a continuance
5 of the scheduling deadlines.

6 Dated: 2/1/08

7 
8 PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL
United States Magistrate Judge